THEOLOGY

VOL. L NOVEMBER, 1947 No. 329

The Case of Gerhard Kittel

THE case of Prof. Gerhard Kittel is one of particular interest in the present theological and intellectual situation of Germany. The *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, of which he is the editor, is the most important production of its kind for many generations, not only as a vast work of scholarship incorporating the new knowledge of the last fifty years, but even more as providing the "documentation" for those Biblical insights which have overthrown liberal theology. As a result, Kittel's reputation is worldwide.

At the same time, ever since the assumption of power by the Nazis made the matter a very practical one, Kittel's attitude to the modern Jewish problem in Germany has often seemed very damning. At first sight what he has written in his pamphlet *Die Judenfrage*, published in 1933, and in various later articles, appears actively to support certain at least of the anti-Semitic principles and measures of the Nazi government. So much was this the case that on the defeat of Germany in 1945 Kittel was interned by the French authorities in a camp at Balingen. In October 1946 this was exchanged for a state of detention ("Zwangsaufenthalt") in the Roman Catholic monastery at Beuron on the upper Danube, where Kittel has since been living and studying. Recently the French Military Government has decided that he shall definitely keep the editorship of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch* in the future.

The question is not merely one of how far Kittel compromised himself with the Nazi party and what, if any, is the proper penalty for his behaviour. This is a matter of great importance for the treatment of many German intellectuals at the present time, but the issues stirred by the case of Kittel go far deeper. They penetrate to the roots of our modern Biblical understanding and make one ask what is the relevance of that understanding for the problems of practical life that demand a decision. For Kittel has always insisted that his attitude to the Jewish question is a direct outcome of his Biblical studies and that it echoes the true teaching of Scripture. In *Die Judenfrage* he repeats again and again that the problem is primarily a religious one, and an article he wrote in 1933 in the *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutheranische Kirchenzeitung* is typical of his consistent approach. It is called "New Testament Ideas about the Jewish Question" and is an examination of Romans ix-xi, about which Kittel writes: "If one desires to take these chapters seriously, if one asks what they have to say to us, then the first question can only be: what do they say about Jewry?" And during his internment at Balingen, Kittel is reported to have said, "My position in the Jewish question is based on Holy Scripture and the tradition of the primitive Christian Church," to have denied that

he had ever prostituted his scholarship to the demands of politics, an to have claimed that he was ready to defend his attitude before th learned world.

Biblical politics have often obstructed obvious Christian truths—on thinks of doctrines of non-resistance and slavery justified by an appea to Scripture. It is not the purpose of this article to point a moral, bu to tell a tale and to rehabilitate, at least to some degree, the reputatio of a great scholar and Christian. But the truth is that, while it woul be presumptuous to question the correctness of Kittel's exegesis, th practical policies to which his conclusions point are such as to offen the religious conscience. It was the salvation of Kittel that in practic they offended his conscience too. His heart was stronger than h head, or perhaps it would be truer to say that grace was stronger tha works. But it may be worth the while of theologians, scholars, an even the readers of a journal called THEOLOGY to ponder how th dilemma arose and to make sure they are not in danger of bein caught in it themselves.

What then has been Kittel's understanding of the history of th Jews and their situation in the modern world? An impressive numb of testimonials has been given in Germany by such famous names a Martin Dibelius, Albrecht Alt, Joachim Jeremias, and the Roma Catholic scholar Karl Prümm to the effect that Kittel's views on th Jewish question had no resemblance to the racial theories elaborate by Rosenberg and the official Nazi doctrinaires, and still less to th popular anti-Semitism of Streicher and the masses. This is undoubtedl true. Kittel's starting-point, as he expresses it in the article to whic reference has already been made, is that the record of the Jews i the Bible is not only the history of redemption ("Heilsgeschichte" but also the history of rejection ("Unheilsgeschichte"). If we talk the chosen people, we must also talk of the cursed and cast-off peopl We have no right to ignore the stern sayings of Christ about th judgment that must fall on the Jews because of their rejection of Hi and that judgment has worked abundantly in their history ever sinc

It can hardly be denied that this is a true account of the emphas of the Bible. It is a vital protest against any humanist or liber attempts to minimize the necessity of a decision about Jesus and th seriousness of the Jewish rejection of Him. Such attempts can on succeed if the opposition to the Judaism of His day shown by Chri in the Gospels is discounted and attributed to a "Tendenz" of th evangelists, writing in the light of developed Jewish-Christian contr versy, as is done in Dr Barnes' recent *The Rise of Christianity*. Th penalty the Jews have incurred, according to Kittel, is that they rema without a land of their own and live only as wanderers and strange among all the nations of the world. He claims in *Die Judenfrage* th the Jews must not seek to circumvent this essentially divine ar religious judgment, either by trying to achieve a national state on more (Zionism) or by becoming full citizens of the modern secul state as it emerged in the nineteenth century (Assimilation). The rig outlook is that of traditional and Rabbinic Judaism: the willi acceptance of the position of universal strangers as a punishment f

Israel's sin—although for Kittel that sin is the rejection of Christ, while for the Rabbis it is the failure strictly to keep the Law. But Kittel knows, too, from the Bible that *any* people which sets itself against the purpose of God will meet with judgment, and that, always, national survival means continual national repentance accepted by the divine mercy. At the close of the article he wrote in 1933 he warns the German nation of this: "For us also, as formerly for Paul's readers, the fate of the Jews is not presented to make us proud, but that, with fear, we should recognize the wrath of the living God, whereby the Lord of history puts down peoples. . . . The final statement of world history for the German people too is, 'that he might have mercy upon all' (Rom. xi, 32)."

Looking back, these words seem prophetic. They ring like some of the pronouncements of the Confessional Church. Plainly, Kittel's analysis of the Jewish problem cannot have been acceptable to a régime which could admit no fault in the Nordic race. There was no inherent "inferiority" in the Jews, and Kittel justified their actual position from their own sacred writings and Rabbinic teaching which were so hated by the Nazis and "German Christians." Further, Kittel has always insisted that as the Jewish problem has arisen from the Jewish rejection of Christ, so it will only be solved finally by the Jewish acceptance of Christ, and that therefore the Church must never cease in its missionary effort to convert the Jews. The idea of any possibility of redemption for the Jews could not, of course, be made to square with official Nazi theories, and this was the point specially singled out for violent attack in a review of *Die Judenfrage* in the *Neues Tübinger Tagblatt* for May 2, 1933. Sworn affidavits from Nazi leaders have testified to the uselessness of Kittel's words for the party's anti-Semitic work and to the suspicion with which it was regarded on account of its intellectual and religious character. Typical is a statement of September 13, 1946, from Dr Reinhold Gräter, formerly head of the National Political Academy ("Napola"), to the effect that neither he nor, as far as he was aware, any of the other two thousand internees at Balingen knew Kittel's works on the Jewish question, and that a discreet silence was kept about them in party circles, since not merely were they of no use for propaganda purposes, but they threatened to destroy the whole basis of the Nazi polemic against the Bible.

There is a number of incautious and damaging statements in *Die Judenfrage*, as when Kittel says that the N.S.D.A.P. "represents the standpoint of a positive Christianity" (p. 10), echoing paragraph 24 of the official Nazi programme. Nevertheless, Kittel repeatedly and publicly showed his abhorrence of the crudities of the official anti-Semitic polemics and exposed their absurdities from the point of view of the scholar, especially as the full significance of the Nazi measures became apparent with the passage of time. Witnesses testify to his ostentatiously walking out of party meetings in 1934 and 1937, when the Church was attacked and the "German Christian" policy expounded. Again, in 1934 Streicher published in *Der Stürmer* an alleged Jewish law making obligatory the slaughter of Gentiles. Kittel was the only German professor openly to attack Streicher after the Nazis

came to power, and he exposed the absurdity of this pretended law in a number of *Deutsche Theologie* for 1934. Especially striking is Karl Prümm's account of a lecture given by Kittel in Vienna University in March 1943: "Prof. Kittel spoke about the ancient people of Israel and expressed opinions, categorically and openly, which ran directly counter to the ideas then officially propagated in Germany. It was my opinion after hearing the lecture, and is so now, that anyone else would have been forbidden to speak as a result. That this did not happen to Prof. Kittel can only be explained by his unique position in the learned world. . . . The amazement of others who heard the lecture at the high courage brought by Prof. Kittel to his open opposition to the National-Socialist ideology was very great."

The Church, Kittel says, has a mission to proclaim full salvation through Christ, to the Jewish race. It seems to follow that if the Jews as a whole, or any individuals among them, repent and acknowledge Christ, the curse incurred by rejecting Him is for them done away. But Kittel says that this emphatically does not mean that such Jews can be incorporated into the modern national state. "The baptism of the Jew does not alter his Jewishness [Judesein]. To become a Christian does not mean to become a German. The converted Jew becomes not a German but a Jewish Christian" (*Die Judenfrage*, p. 70). It is just at this point that the practical conclusions Kittel draws from his attitude are liable to alarm us. It leads him to attack violently the whole process of "assimilation" which went on in nineteenth-century Germany. No doubt he has every justification for pointing out that the baptism of very many Jews has been a mere mockery, undergone not with the intention of becoming Christians but of becoming Gentiles. But Kittel claims sweepingly that the influence of assimilated Jewry on art, literature, drama and the press has uniformly led to what he terms decadence. No Jew should teach in German schools or universities or hold a position in any of the professions. Marriages between Jews and Gentiles should be forbidden, and Kittel speaks approvingly of the laws against the Jews promulgated in Germany in the earlier part of 1933. And the separation holds good even in the Christian Church. Jewish Christians must form their own congregations, and no Jew may be an ordained pastor or elder of a German congregation. Such is the teaching of *Die Judenfrage*.

Yet even here Kittel's views diverge very markedly from those of the Nazis. He does not deny that the Jews are capable of great art, great literature, great scholarship and great religious insight, as the Nazis did. On the contrary, he believes the Jews are: it is only that "assimilation" has been as harmful to their own culture as it has to the German. If the Jews freely accept their separateness, their civilization will flourish, to be recognized gladly by all. They should occupy in the German state exactly the same position as national minorities such as the Danes or Poles. So Jewish Christians who live where there is no organized congregation of their own may of course be admitted to the worship and sacraments of a German church.

It is perhaps not difficult to discover the fallacy underlying Kittel's own solution of the Jewish problem, whereby the Jews would occupy

a minority status ("Gastzustand") in every nation. He claims that the deleterious influence of Jewry on national cultures springs from the fact that the Jews are a homeless people, and so bound to a superficial internationalism in every sphere. But this lack of nationality is a direct penalty for their rejection of Christ. The Jewish future is to become a distinct nation, redeemed by the acceptance of the Christian Messiah. But if the Jews become a Christian nation, it is difficult to see why they may not be permitted the right of other Christian nations—to fructify each other's national life. For a minority to live as exclusively to itself as Kittel wishes the Jews or Jewish Christians to do is not only impossible, but even to attempt it would at once create an artificial and irritating situation. Kittel's vision of a Christian Jewish nation fulfilling its destiny by recognizing the true Messiah is not to be realized by forbidding Jews to marry Gentiles or to join with them in the pursuit of learning, the professions and the arts. It can hardly be questioned that Kittel here does surrender far too much ground to racial theories, and that because he does not hold together all the various emphases of Scripture. The Bible message of Romans x, 12, Ephesians ii, 11-18, and Colossians iii, 10, 11 is surely that, while natural divisions of nation and race are not done away in the Christian community, they become so unimportant as not seriously to affect normal human intercourse in Christ. On the contrary, in Kittel's view, the effect of Christianity, by restoring a true nationhood to the Jews, is really to raise those divisions to even greater importance. He raises up, rather than breaks down, the "middle wall of partition."

Yet, however mistaken his ultimate conclusions may seem, Kittel's approach to the Jewish question is one of love and respect, springing from a profound knowledge of Jewish history and life. There is no trace in his writings of that racial hatred against everything Jewish which marked official Nazi policy. This can be proved by Kittel's dealings with individual "non-Aryans," several of whom have recently testified on his behalf, during the years of National-Socialist rule. In spite of his fame and the leading position he occupied in scholarly circles, he continued to associate with people of Jewish blood, and frequently to help them in their inevitable difficulties, sometimes at considerable personal risk. It was precisely in his own particular sphere that Kittel discovered the inadequacy of his theories. It would appear to follow from his position that a non-Aryan should have no part in "German" education and learning, but this affidavit from one of his pupils tells its own story: "Prof. Kittel is well known to me from my student days at Tübingen. I graduated Doctor of Theology under him in 1939. Although, as a non-Aryan [Mischling] of the first grade under the Nuremberg laws, I had great difficulty in completing my regular studies, Prof. Kittel always encouraged me in word and deed and helped me where he could. When it was questionable whether I should be given permission to graduate and I myself wanted to give up the idea, Prof. Kittel prevailed upon me to submit my application. Thanks to his testimony, I received permission to graduate. In spite of the harsh decisions against publishing learned works in books, Prof. Kittel proposed that I should have my dis-

sertation published in a theological journal which he edited." It i perhaps one of the worst signs of the times in which we live that such simple acts of goodness have to be put in as evidence to defend a man' reputation, but certainly there is no lack of this kind of evidence fo Kittel's actions.

What is abundantly clear from all the news that comes from Germany is that Kittel has in no way forfeited the veneration of th world of learning. Indeed, in many respects the late war and th grim years before it have made that veneration deeper than ever, an this is perhaps Kittel's best vindication. A common enemy in German brought together the Protestant and Roman Churches, in joint actio and resistance, more closely than had ever been possible before. Th case of Kittel is a remarkable witness to the fact that this new under standing has extended to the domain of theology and Biblical scholar ship. Roman Catholic scholars have testified to the deep insight an knowledge they found in Kittel's recent lectures in Vienna, where h appeared to them not only as the scholar but also as the prophet Biblical religion inside the Nazi state. The Abbot of Beuron ha written that "the Catholic Church and Catholic theology takes lively interest in 'the case of Kittel.' His labours and his learned work have been for years highly esteemed among us, as is shown by th many Catholic hearers of his lectures and the great use made of h writings in Catholic circles." Most striking of all, in January 194 Kittel was asked by the authorities of the Papal Archæological Institu at Rome if he would undertake the editorship of the second volum of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*, a collection of all the ancien Jewish inscriptions, left unfinished by the death of the original edito Fr Jean-Baptiste Frey, in 1939. The choice of a Protestant is caus for comment enough, but that the Protestant should be Kittel, who circumstances are fully known at Rome, is a recognition not only his immense scholarship, but also of the services he rendered to sever Roman Catholic professors who felt the weight of Nazi persecutio especially in Austria after 1938.

Such is the evidence in the case of Kittel. Perhaps one last testimon may be given—to the man himself. The Abbot of Beuron has bee in close contact with Kittel since his residence in the Abbey began year ago. This is the picture he drew of Kittel early this year: "A we have learnt to know him, he is not merely the international recognized scholar, not merely the earnest investigator of the problem of the New Testament and early Christian literature, not merely th great editor of the world-famous *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neue Testament*, but just the godly, candid, responsible Christian. With a his great learned triumphs, he remains the humble man who bow before the divine authority of Scripture, for whom the Word of G has become the most fundamental norm of life and knowledge. H learning has become for him a true piety of the heart, which give rise to no intellectual pride, which convinces by its noble simplicit and which naturally links the great man in his world fame with th simple man of the people."

J. R. PORTER.

The Disintegration of the Christian Initiation Rite

THE Christian initiation rite, as modern scholarship has made abundantly clear, was originally a unity, comprising in one coherent whole the two parts which the Western Church now administers in separation and to which have been given the names of baptism and confirmation. The progress of the attempted theological justification of this division has already been outlined by Dom Gregory Dix in his Oxford lecture, but the actual steps in the process which made such later justification necessary yet remain to be traced. It must, of course, be admitted that the stages in the disruption of the Christian initiation rite cannot be clearly defined, since the rupture was due to pressure of circumstances rather than being either a development inherent in apostolic teaching and practice or the result of a deliberate decision by the Church as a whole. Nevertheless it is possible to indicate the influences which produced the division and at the same time to consider whether or not in submitting to them the Church was mistaken.

First and foremost it is to be noted that even in the primitive rite itself, despite its liturgical and doctrinal unity, there were yet two or even three ministers. In the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus a deacon stands in the water with the candidate, a presbyter asks the questions and anoints with chrism, while the bishop imposes his hand and performs a second anointing (xxi, xxii). In the Byzantine Liturgy of the Barberini MS., analysed by Prof. Ratcliff,[1] it is a priest who baptizes in water and the patriarch who seals the candidate. This differentiation of function would appear to go back to New Testament times, for after the "Pentecost" of the Gentiles at Cæsarea Peter did not himself officiate at the water baptism, but "commanded them to be baptized" (Acts x, 48). Thus from the outset the Christian initiation rite, by the very fact that different parts of it were the responsibility of different ministers, was liable to division, since if through any circumstances one of the ministers could not be present there was the possibility of the minister who was available performing that part of the rite for which he was primarily responsible. Indeed, there was even the possibility of the first part of the rite being performed without any of the authorized ministers being present at all, for the permission accorded to the laity to baptize in cases of danger or necessity made the presbyter, at least, not indispensable.

Whether or not lay baptism took place in the Apostolic Age is not certain (*cf.*, however, Acts ix, 18; x, 48; 1 Cor. i, 14-17), the first unmistakable evidence being provided by Tertullian (*De Bapt.* xviii). It was authorized by the Council of Elvira, A.D. 305 or 306, canon 38 of which allows it in cases of necessity, but adds the proviso that the bishop has to "perfect" the candidates afterwards. This indicates that by the end of the second century, and quite possibly much earlier, the division of the Christian initiation rite was not considered wrong in abnormal circumstances as long as the second part, the especial

[1] THEOLOGY, September 1946.

duty of the bishop, was not unnecessarily delayed. In reaching thi decision the Church was undoubtedly swayed by the canon of th New Testament, wherein instances of the separation of baptism an confirmation are expressly recorded (*e.g.*, Acts viii, 14-17).

The main influences that ultimately made this separation habitua were recurrent conditions of emergency, the gradual extension o infant baptism, and the great increase in the number of professin Christians.

The first type of emergency likely to occur more or less frequentl was serious illness. Under such circumstances it was permissible t baptize the sick person, whose initiation was later completed by th bishop. Hence Cornelius, in his letter to Fabius, after describing th baptism of Novatian by affusion, continues, "nor yet did he indee obtain the other things, when he recovered from his sickness, of whic one should partake according to the rule of the Church, or the sealin by the bishop. And as he did not obtain these, how could he obtai the Holy Spirit?"[1] It is not surprising, therefore, to find that thi clinical baptism, as it was called, was not looked on with favour b the Church, and the twelfth canon of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea, a the beginning of the fourth century, forbade anyone so baptized to b ordained priest.

To the second type of emergency attention has already been called. During times of persecution, when Christians were liable to be seize and executed, Christian parents, mindful of the welfare of thei children, probably desired to have them brought into the fellowshi of the Church. Unable to secure the services of the bishop owing t a variety of reasons, they would approach the nearest presbyter, wh fully appreciating the sincerity of their request and taking into accou the abnormality of the times, was prepared to administer his part o the rite, leaving the "seal" to be given when opportunity arose. It quite possible that this was also one of the principal influences favourin infant baptism.

The New Testament evidence for infant baptism is of no grea value—"household" may or may not include children—but in th second century there are sufficient data available to make clear that was practised. Justin Martyr speaks of many "who have been Christ disciples from childhood"[3]; Irenæus mentions "infants, and childre and boys, and youths, and old men," who "are born again to God.' Tertullian, in attempting to discourage it, reveals that it was in vogue In Cyprian's day it was customary to baptize children within a fe days of their being born,[6] and despite further protests to the contrary- *e.g.*, by Gregory Nazianzus, who suggested that baptism be deferre until three years of age so that they may at least "receive impressions' —the initiation of infants into the Church gradually became a established practice. It is to be noted, however, that it was n universal until the fifth century, its development being retarded part by the fear of post-baptismal sin—although this factor became of le

[1] Eusebius, *H.E.* vi, 43. 15. [2] Ronald Dix, THEOLOGY, November 1945.
[3] *Apol.* xv. [4] *Haer.* II. xxii. 4. [5] *Op. cit.* xviii. [6] *Ep.* lviii. 2.
[7] *Orat.* xl, *De Bapt.*

importance as penitential discipline increased—and partly by the belief, prior to the formulation of the doctrine of Original Sin, that children had no real need of the "laver of regeneration."[1] The Pelagian controversy, and above all the teaching of St Augustine, led to the demand by parents and ecclesiastics alike to have the children baptized as soon as possible after birth, and as a result of this and the gradual growth of infant baptism in the preceding centuries the primitive custom of baptizing only on Holy Saturday and during Pentecost was disregarded; indeed, various enactments, such as the laws of Ina, 690, to the effect that parents were to present their children within thirty days of birth,[2] rendered it impossible of fulfilment. If with this fact, that children were liable to be baptized on any day of the year, be also coupled the great increase in candidates consequent upon the termination of the persecutions and especially after the Peace of the Church under Constantine, it is apparent that it became a sheer physical impossibility for the bishops to be present on all occasions when the initiation rite was performed.

Faced with this situation, the bishops had three courses of action open to them. In the first place they could have increased their numbers so as to ensure that there was always one of them available for initiations, wherever they might take place. This, however, they did not do; but it is worthy of emphasis that it was from Italy, where the number of bishops was relatively high, that the rule of reserving confirmation for the bishop alone spread over Western Europe.

Alternatively, the bishops could have delegated their authority to the presbyters and allowed them to conduct the whole service. In the West the bishops were not prepared to do this, but there seems to have been a protracted struggle, with the presbyters attempting to extend the scope of their authority as they had done in connexion with the Eucharist. As early as the second century Tertullian found it necessary to warn against anyone assuming "the specific (*dicatum*) function of the bishop,"[3] a phrase which must refer to the act of "confirmation," which was the bishop's special privilege and duty. By the time of Augustine, however, presbyteral confirmation was by no means uncommon, for he speaks of a child being taken to the presbyters and "it was baptized, sanctified, anointed, received the imposition of the hand."[4] In Gaul and Spain the practice was widespread, but in Italy the Roman bishops made a firm stand against it, and Innocent I declared that presbyters had no right "to sign the brow with the same oil, which is reserved to the bishops alone, when they impart the Spirit, the Paraclete."[5] By the time of Gregory the Great even this interdiction was withdrawn; at first he upheld Innocent's injunction: "presbyters should anoint candidates for baptism upon the breast, so that the bishops afterwards may properly anoint them on the forehead,"[6] but later he wrote, "it has also come to our ears that some have been offended by our having forbidden presbyters to touch with

[1] *Vide* T. Thompson, *The Offices of Baptism and Confirmation*, 1914, pp. 178*f*.
[2] *Vide* J. Johnson, *Collection of the Laws and Canons of the Church of England*, 1850, Vol. I, p. 132.
[3] *Op. cit.* xvii. [4] *Sermo* cccxxiv. [5] *Ep.* xxv. [6] *Ep.* iv. 9.

chrism those who are to be baptized. The fact is that we only acte in accordance with the ancient usage of our Church; but certainly, any are distressed at the thing, we give leave that, when there is lac of bishops, presbyters may touch with chrism, even upon their fore heads, the candidates for baptism."[1] Yet despite this permission th bishops managed to retain their function as ministers of the secon part of the initiation rite, and during the Carolingian period th Roman rule was everywhere acknowledged, although at the preser day in the Roman Church the Pope is considered to have the powe to grant priests the privilege of administering it. In the East, howeve it was this solution to the problem that was adopted, and the paris priest from an early date confirmed with chrism that had bee episcopally blessed.

It was the third possibility that finally won the day in the West– *viz.*, that the presbyters should perform that part of the rite of whic they were the authorized ministers, leaving the bishops to complet the initiation and so regularize the position as soon as possible. Thu Jerome speaks of "the usage of the Church, that the bishop shoul make excursions to those who have been baptized a long way off i the smaller towns by presbyters and deacons, to lay his hand upo them for the invoking of the Holy Ghost."[2]

The final stimulus to the disintegration of the rite was no doub given by the controversies that raged over the question of rebaptism In the third century the predominant view at Carthage, where Cypria was its foremost advocate, was that schismatical baptism was invalic Cyprian not only upheld the apostolic doctrine, but he also considere that it was inseparably connected with the liturgical practice, and h asserted that anyone returning to the bosom of the Church mus undergo the whole initiation rite.[4] In making this stand he was bu following in the steps of Tertullian[5] and of the Councils of Iconiu and Synnada,[6] who had declared heretical baptism invalid, for th same principle was involved. Cyprian's opponents, notably Stephe while sharing his theology of baptism, did not consider that it woul be in any way impaired if the unity of the liturgical expression wa broken. In taking this line they had the examples of clinical, lay, an infant baptism before them, and they therefore affirmed that schi matic and heretical baptism were to be accepted, but that any perso who had undergone such a rite, on desiring to become a member o the Catholic Church, must receive the Holy Ghost by the laying o of hands. It was this last way of thinking which eventually prevailed and the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, decreed in its eighth canon tha any baptism in the name of the Trinity is valid, only the impositio of the hand being required to complete the initiation; but it was th decree in effect that ultimately led to the disintegration of the unit of the one rite.

It has to be admitted that the consequences of this disintegratio in the West brought about by the influences outlined above are by n

[1] *Ep.* iv. 26. [2] *Dial. adv. Lucif.* vii.
[3] *Cf.* Gregory Dix, *The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism*, 1946, p. 17
[4] *Ep.* lxix-lxxv. [5] *Op. cit.* xv. [6] Eusebius, *H.E.* vii. 7.

means commendable. In the first place confirmation itself has ceased to have anything like its primitive importance since the transference to water baptism of its original significance. In the second place this very transference has led to theological absurdities, such as the permission to partake of communion even before confirmation. Moreover, if lay baptism and heretical baptism be valid, and if also water baptism—as medieval teaching declares—conveys the gift of the Spirit, then anyone, Christian or otherwise, can convey that gift; and the logical conclusion of the process is found in the works of the canonist Raymond of Pennafort, who affirmed that anyone, if there be danger of death, whether Pagan or Jew, heretic, schismatic or excommunicate, may baptize and presumably bestow the Spirit.[1] In the East, on the other hand, where the unity of the rite has been preserved, although at the expense of direct episcopal participation, the administration of baptism is in general confined to priests.

But were these consequences inevitable? Dom Gregory Dix would have us believe that they were not, since he considers a return to primitive practice unnecessary; what is needed, according to him, is not the reunion of the sacrament but right teaching.[2] But if the Christian initiation ceremony be one sacrament and not two—and we should be mindful of Mason's dictum that "Baptism and Confirmation can only be regarded, by those who value the teaching of antiquity, as forming together one sacrament"[3]—and if the relation between the two parts is "one of essential unity rather than of mere liturgical association,"[4] it is difficult to see on what grounds continued acquiescence in this dismemberment can be justified. That the primitive Church was prepared to accept the division in *abnormal circumstances* is a precedent that cannot be lightly disregarded, but this is a very different thing from accepting the division as the normal and habitual practice. This, however, is precisely what the present Bishop of Derby proposes to do, and in his *Christian Initiation* he sees no reason for altering the present practice, nor indeed for any different emphasis in teaching. Yet water baptism alone is "an unfinished fragment,"[5] and it is almost impossible to define what it confers apart from confirmation, since in the New Testament the doctrinal expositions of the initiation rite presuppose the unity and do not treat of the parts in isolation. This should not be taken to mean that water baptism is not of paramount importance; the catechumen must pass through the Red Sea before he can be given the abiding presence of the cloud. But this cleansing preparatory act, this dying and rising with Christ, loses much of its meaning if it be separated from that act which completes it, and through which the Spirit of the Ascended Lord is conveyed, and the converse has proved to be equally and sadly true. If the question be posited, without pressing the details too far, in the form of the Old Testament antetypes, so dear to the fathers, the error of the division is made even clearer. To undergo water baptism and to delay the baptism of the Spirit is to remain planted in the sands

[1] *Summa*, iii. 17. [2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 34, 35.
[3] *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, 1891, p. 1.
[4] Prof. Ratcliff, THEOLOGY, October 1946. [5] Mason, *op. cit.*, p. 414.

of the Red Sea instead of pressing onwards into the Promised Land it is to dwell on the bank of the Jordan instead of going forward to taste the milk and honey which is part of the inheritance of the Chosen People and which, in the second-century rite, was the symbol of the entrance of the members of the New Israel into the Kingdom of the Son.

However strong the influences were which issued in this disintegration, the disintegration itself was not inevitable. The problem which the Church had to face could have been solved in another way; not by accepting the Eastern practice, but by increasing the number of bishops and at the same time so regulating the performance of the rite at special times in different places that except in abnormal circumstances it could be administered in its totality. In failing to take this course of action, and in succumbing to the disintegrating influences, the Western Church can only be considered to have made an unfortunate mistake from which we are today still suffering, both theologically and pastorally, for matters of expediency should never be allowed to count when it is a question of the Church being true to her apostolic heritage.

J. G. Davies.

"The Works of Thy Hands"[1]

All last term the sixth-form biology class in many schools has been busy dissecting the dog-fish, the frog, and the rabbit, and has been duly impressed by the clear gradations, the homology, between the internal organs. It has also learnt from its textbook and from its master that this homology is due to evolution and natural selection. The more thoughtful in the class will have gone to their public library and there under the heading of Evolution they will have found not one book but many books, and books published over a long period all implying after many chapters of evidence that "the purpose manifested in evolution . . . is only an apparent purpose. It is just as much a product of blind forces as is the falling of a stone to earth," to quote one of the more recent of them.[2]

At the "Britain Can Make It" Exhibition one of the most interesting sections was that devoted to "Designing an Egg-Cup." There could be seen a man, the designer, first wrinkling his brows over his breakfast egg, then attending conferences with his business and factory managers, next (most significantly) studying egg-cups previously manufactured, and finally drawing a blue-print of a machine that would produce many thousands of egg-cups. The question arises, why all this planning over the production of an egg-cup, while our complicated school frog is said to be produced by a blind unreasoning process? Why cannot the egg-cup be produced by a process of evolution and natural selection as well as the frog? Perhaps it has been so produced.

It is the purpose of this essay to trace briefly the analogy between the evolution of objects made by man and the evolution of animal

[1] Psalm viii, 6. [2] Julian Huxley, *Evolution: The Modern Synthesis*, 1942.

and plants. It is an astonishingly close analogy, and, what does not appear to have been formerly pointed out, modern biological research seems to be bringing it closer. Thus the development of modern ships from the primitive coracle can be compared in practically every feature with the development of mammals from the protozoa. The succession of dominant types, embryological recapitulation (in the shipyards), vestigial structures, survival of the fittest, adaptation to new environments, characteristics of geographical and ecological speciation, particulate mutation—all the terminology of the evolutionist might be applied equally to a battleship as to a tiger.

If it is supposed that God is related to His creation in the same way that man is related to his, then something of the nature of God should be revealed by a detailed study of animals and plants, just as man's nature might be gleaned from a study of buses and buildings and everything else that he makes.

To begin with, Nature reveals the unity of God. Although superficially she exhibits as much if not more variety than man-made objects, the more closely she is studied the more clear is her fundamental unity. With very few exceptions all animals and plants are constructed from the living cell and its protoplasmic contents. They all show chromosomes, and nearly all exhibit at some stage in their life-cycle the phenomenon of meiosis[1] by which the Mendelian laws of heredity are maintained. Again, all life has the same fundamental metabolism, in which compounds of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen are built up with absorption of energy and broken down with the release of energy. There is no comparable unity in the things that man has made, taken all together, but there is an analogous unity in the creative work of any one man. For example, the paintings of Rubens are not only characterized by Rubens' personality but also by his subject-matter, and again by the chemical composition of the paints and varnishes that he uses.

Next, God appears to create by a process exactly comparable to that practised by man. In any creative act, whether it be painting a picture or designing an egg-cup, inspiration, planning, and trial-and-error, are all interwoven together. Exactly the same processes may be traced in the origins of plant and animal species.

First, trial-and-error, or, to use the evolutionists' word, selection. That selection plays an overruling part in evolution cannot be denied. Darwin's original conceptions have been considerably modified and elaborated, but the basic idea has become more and more substantiated. Natural selection, however, has an exact parallel in human selection. A good example is the selection of the 25-pounder gun during the war. At the beginning of the war several "species" of field-gun were being manufactured, including the old 18-pounder, the 3·7-in. howitzer, the 75-mm. and others; but it was the 25-pounder that steadily superseded the others for field use and became the "dominant species." The others survived where they were "ecologic-

[1] The mechanism by which the number of chromosomes is halved during the formation of a reproductive cell.

ally adapted" (the easily handled 3·7-in. howitzer in mountaino country) or "geographically isolated" (the 18-pounder was us throughout the Abyssinian Campaign). Such selection is "inte specific" (between species), but "intraspecific selection" (amongst t individual variations in any one species) is also at work. This wou account for the various marks of 25-pounder guns. Some marks a held in some localities, others elsewhere; some marks are abundan others rare; while some marks never passed the initial testing sta and were not manufactured at all.

As in Nature, selection may eventually lead to a new species. T 3-in. field-gun of the 1914-18 war became adapted by a process intraspecific selection to the new "environmental influence" of t aeroplane, and a sub-species, the 3-in. 20-cwt. anti-aircraft g resulted. This was identical in many respects to the earlier marks the 3·7-in. anti-aircraft gun, which may be regarded as a new speci Such is Darwin's theory of the Origin of Species, but it is by no mea incompatible with the doctrine of Special Creation. Each speci even every variation in our guns, is the result of careful planning a creative mind. Truly are the hairs of our heads all numbere Selection is a major part of creation, but it need not be the whole of

Attempts are being made to systematize the factors underlyi selection in Nature, but there is such a multiplicity of influenc affecting variation and selection that little definite and clear progr has been made. Similar complications would ensue were an attem made to classify the factors underlying human selection; it is or necessary to think how different are the factors which cause selecti among guns from those among egg-cups. It would be possible to a whole book on this subject, and only a few points can be mention here. Selection operates in more than one way. In Nature surviv or length of life, is the main consideration, but fertility may another. Any gardener knows that a fertile "throwback" will tend oust more highly specialized varieties of any plant. Similarly an eas manufactured cheap egg-cup will tend to replace numerically a m expensive article, even though the latter be more adapted to purpose. Comparisons might be made, were there space, betwe rare and abundant species and the way selection acts upon them; correlation of varying selection pressure with the degree of adapt specialization; production of clines or gradients in speciation; a much else.

It is interesting to note here that in our analogy life and death animals correspond to the period of active use of, for instance, 25-pounder gun, and to the moment when the gun is discard Although the gun may grow old *slowly*, there comes a *moment* decision, a decision by man, that the gun is no longer fit for serv Animal life is similarly terminated decisively and not slowly. Adr tedly, nobody dies without some medical reason, nor is a gun senten unserviceable or obsolete without some mechanical reason; nevert less a decision is involved. The point is fundamental, because whole theory of Natural Selection is based on death.

To suggest that God creates by a process of trial-and-error ra

perhaps unpalatable theological implications. However, the idea is certainly not ruled out by the way God deals with humanity according to the Old Testament—that is, to destroy it if it is no good. Was not Israel the chosen or *selected* race in history? Was it naturally selected or purposely selected? The religious interpretations of biology and history have much in common; Darwinism is related to Marxism.

Now as to the evidence for planning on the part of the Creator. *Natural* selection presupposes that a particular species gives rise to *random* variations, and that in the struggle for existence only the advantageous variations survive. In our analogy it is as though many factories were to produce egg-cups of *random* shapes and sizes, but that only the factory making egg-cups which the public wanted would pay its way and continue to function. This is perhaps feasible in the case of an egg-cup and very close to the facts. In the case of a gun, however, if all the parts were made in a random way the probability of any gun being made at all would be practically nil—nothing would fit. The original conception of "genes" as factors carried in the germinal cell and in every body-cell, which accurately controlled the whole structure of an animal and which were carried from one animal to another in reproduction, helped to clarify this point. Modern research, however, is not confirming this. While it is now thought that much and every variation in any one particular species is due to "Mendelizing gene-differences," these latter alter their effect according to their position in the chromosomes and according to the nature of the other genes present. It is a common experience in laboratory cultures for an adverse mutation[1] to occur which makes the stock temporarily difficult to maintain. Rearrangement and mutual adjustment of the genes subsequently occur, and after a few generations the vitality of the stock is restored. Such phenomena have been extensively analysed and have led to the conception of chromosomes as "*organic* carefully balanced gene arrangements," to quote J. Huxley again.

On top of this revolutionary concept comes the discovery of "polyploidy"—the fact that the number of chromosomes, hitherto held to be constant for every species, can be doubled, trebled, reduced by a few or altered in a variety of ways, producing nothing more than minor variations, and often reinvigoration, in the species. Returning to our analogy, these facts and the whole of Mendelism[2] suggest that the genes may be compared to operatives and their machines in a factory. They are not the blue-print (which is what most biologists presuppose them to be), although they directly control the object produced. Their lay-out and interrelations are all important; Mendelism is the interchange of operatives; mutations result when operatives change their performance in any way. The occurrence of mutations, which are always deleterious in laboratory stocks, may be accelerated by X-rays. Recovery subsequently occurs, just like the products of a factory which has been machine-gunned. Polyploidy is

[1] The appearance of a variation in a species, which has not been previously observed, but which is subsequently hereditable.

[2] Abbot Mendel was the first to formulate laws of heredity.

comparable to doubling up the production lines of a factory whic will have little effect on the final product, providing the blue-print unchanged. In Huxley's book the "blue-print" aspect in any organis is passed over in the following footnote: "I refer to the extraordinar functional adaptation of fine structure and often size seen in bone tendons, blood-vessels, etc. These have frequently been held up impossible of explanation on a selectionist view. So they would be they were the result of genetic adaptation; but all the details appe to be due to modificational adaptation, produced anew by function demands in each individual. The general framework is geneticall adaptive, and so is the general capacity for reaction; the rest modificational polish." Some polish.

An immense amount of work is being done on gene effects: t varieties of dandelions, the spots on lady-birds, the darkening of mot in industrial districts, the famous Drosophila, are some example When reading the original papers the bewildering mass of data often immensely clarified by the thought that genes are like operativ working to a plan, rather than parts of the plan itself, which is t tacit assumption that most research workers make. The usual explan tion of the inevitable "reversion to wild-type" (production of mongrel in fact the whole theory of dominant and recessive genes, has be extensively confused by recent work.

The third distinctive process in natural creation is inspiration—t incorporation into life of a major "new idea." Every textbook biology will illustrate how life has evolved by a series of major ste the protozoa, the insects, the vertebrates, fish, birds, mammals, ma The links between these steps are what most perplex the mechanis evolutionist. Our analogy is perhaps closer on this point than on a other. The "invention" of warm blood in animals, for instance, a the subsequent rapid development of all types of mammals and bir adapted to every type of habitat, is so very like the invention of t petrol engine and the subsequent development of a vast variety cars, boats, and aeroplanes that it is hard to escape the obvio inference. This "adaptive radiation" is characteristic of all classes animal and plant life and forms a basis on which the evolution many natural species has been extensively analysed. There is t classical work of Matthews, in which the evolution of the mod horse, with its single digit hoof, from its four-toed mammalian ancest Eohippus, has been traced in every minute detail in fossils. Similar the slow development of the modern steam locomotive might be trac in every detail back to Stephenson's "Rocket." But how did "Rocket," or the first mammal, evolve? Museums and palæontolo respectively give few clues to this question.

The succession of dominant types—fish, reptiles, mammals- reflected in many other ways in the succession: sail, steam, pet Perhaps most significant of all is the whole trend of evolution progress up to and including *Homo sapiens*. To quote from Hux again, this consists "in a raising of the upper level of biologi efficiency, this being defined as increased control over and indep dence of the environment." The same could be said of progress

the inventions of man (substituting "mechanical" for "biological"). Again, in both schemes of creation advanced things and primitive things are put to each other's service. Man is an essential part of the life-cycle of the protozoan malarial parasite. Electrical engineering is used in the production of our primitive egg-cup.

Biology finds increasingly that life is everywhere interdependent. The creation of animals necessitates the creation of putrefying bacteria for the less pleasant aspects of their metabolism. The creation of houses necessitates drains and sewers. Modern biology cannot contradict St Augustine: "In the details (of Creation) there are things which, because they suit not some parts, are counted evil, yet these same things suit other parts, and are good to them, and are good in themselves."[1] Apart from apparent evil, there is much that is apparently meaningless. Much weight is given in evolutionary theory to functional vestigial structures (such as the human appendix). A glance at a London taxi-cab will show how "vestigial structures" persist, even in creation by man. Buildings, particularly churches, are full of "vestigial structures." Whether conservatism and a regard for tradition, which prompt apparently the construction of our singular taxi-cabs, can be attributed to God, however, is problematical. The elaboration of bird-song, the colours of flowers and butterflies, in fact all hypertely,[2] is inexplicable to the mechanistic evolutionist. We know why we make violins, cricket bats, cathedrals and much else; but these things no doubt would perplex anybody who did not.

It is not the purpose of this essay to discuss the further theological implications of "inventing," "planning" and "selecting" on the part of the Creator. St John has said, "without Him was not anything made that hath been made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men"; it is to be expected, therefore, that men would create in the same manner in which God creates. Man himself has not changed in spite of all his inventions, nor, we may believe, has God.

In conclusion it must be pointed out that this essay has drawn only an analogy and has not attempted to prove anything positively. As has been emphasized formerly, "the force of analogy is this, that it refers what is doubtful to something like it which is not in question, that it may prove things uncertain by things certain."[3] The implication is that the facts of biology can be interpreted on the basis of Christianity just as well as on, possibly, a mechanistic basis. The point, however, is this: Christianity is *one* reality upon which not only biology but everything else, be it politics, art, history or any man's personal life, can begin to be interpreted. To end on the note with which this essay began, it is this unity which modern scholastic education, taken as a whole, requires so necessarily.

GILBERT WALTON.

[1] *Confessions*, Chap. XIII.
[2] Hypertely: the extension of adaptation beyond the limits of utility.
[3] Quintilian. Quoted by Bishop Butler in *Analogy of Religion to the Course of Nature*.

Christianity—Church—Sacrament—II

After the world conferences "on faith and order" the inquiry into *the nature of the Church* became a matter of new and far-reaching interest.

At one of our Old Catholic congresses I once formulated the following theses:

(1) "The Gospel of Christ came into the world to be proclaimed through the ages. Where there is a Gospel there must be a church. By the word 'gospel' we must not only understand the doctrine of Jesus Christ, but also His work. The 'good news' not only consists in the possibility of redemption, but in redemption itself. The Gospel clearly shows, but reality teaches it also, that wherever the message of redemption is believed a community arises which treasures it up, enlarges it and preaches it. Christendom outside the Church neglects history, neglects the organic structure of the human race, and moreover fails to appreciate the divine character of the Gospel of atonement. Experience teaches that movements outside the Church fizzle out in moralism, or again consolidate into new church-communities."

(2) "In virtue of the message it preserves and passes, the Church is not merely a society of equally minded individuals, or a church of the Word, but the house of salvation, the haven of rescue, where redemption becomes a reality, where the life of God through Christ vibrates, reveals itself and is communicated. She is the Body of Christ who is her Head. That is what she ought to be; but let us add at once, she has been deficient from the very beginning. Wherever and whenever a divine idea is embodied in man the human vesture will show stains. And the Church, the Body of Christ, is also shaped by man; and man, even when redeemed, ever stumbles. The Church, being the institution desired by God, the bearer of God's reconciliation in Christ, is the entrance to the kingdom of God. But in its form, fixed by man, it always limps behind its ideal, it is never identical with the kingdom of God. And therefore no church can proclaim itself the Body of Christ, excluding other churches. For the Body of Christ is one and undivided, and every church, even though it thinks it has never deviated from the ancient 'depositum,' is to blame for division, separation or dissension."

In these theses I give expression to the thought that the Church is necessary and willed by God. In the New Testament this is undoubtedly an undisputed fact. The Church is the natural and imperative result of the revelation and of Christ's work of redemption. And for this reason it is not merely an organization, but an institution of salvation, an organism of salvation, so closely bound up with Christ, that it is the Body of which He is the Head. That union is such that St Paul (Eph. v, 32) calls it a "musterion mega," a "sacramentum magnum." According to the doctrine of the New Testament, its task is the distribution of salvation by word and grace. This makes it clear that *sacrament and office* form part of the vital elements of the Church.

But all knowledge and life, forthcoming from the grace of God, make use of natural, human ways, and therefore the Church remains an

organism which finds its form and permanence in man; this is the weak point of the Church. It is not God's kingdom itself. The "extra ecclesiam nulla salus" contains some truth, but only when viewed from the side of God; no church community can or may apply it to itself. Only "God knows them that are His." Considered from our point of view the Church is the only harbour of salvation, but God is not tied down to a human harbour. It is the same as with baptism. We consider baptism in the belief in Jesus Christ—*i.e.*, baptism in the name of Holy Trinity—necessary for salvation; which again means that for us, men, baptism is the entrance, the admittance to the kingdom of God; but we do not prescribe the law to God; He Himself is not tied down to the limits He has set to us.

The pluriformity of the churches is undoubtedly a sin of Christendom, for the Body of Christ is one and indivisible, and pluriformity is laceration of what is one and indivisible. But this is no reason why the one church, the "una sancta"—call it "ecclesia invisibilis," if you like, though I do not love the term—should be lost to sight, should be beyond reach. But our pluriformity is, indeed, the bandage which prevents us from seeing the limits as well as the extent of that one church. No church can therefore call herself the true church—*i.e.*, the only saving one; she can strive to belong to it, she can at most be convinced that this endeavour is fully justified, assure people that *she* forms part of it, but she cannot say that some other church does not belong to it. For every church is to blame for the disintegration, directly and indirectly; and as long as the life of grace and the Holy Spirit are still found in a church, nobody and no church have the right to declare that another church is cut off from Christ.

In this sense our Church endeavours to belong to the "una sancta catholica et apostolica."

Its *unity* is bound up with the one Lord Jesus Christ, whose place cannot be taken by any man, not even a pope. It reveals itself by one faith, in a human way only interpreted by a confession or a symbol; and in one baptism for the remission of sins through the belief in Jesus Christ. Should it be permitted to give a ruling, we should say that whosoever believes in the one Lord, and has been baptized into Him for the forgiveness of sins, belongs to the one Church which is the Body of Christ.

The Church is *holy*, and her holiness is bound to her alone. In her lies the salvation and blessedness in Christ, not outside her. Her members are the "saints," sold and bound to holiness and to the Lord of holiness; they are kings and priests and temples of the Spirit at the same time. And every individual church, desiring to be holy, must possess that holy Lord and His Holy Spirit, must live up to His holy doctrine and instil His holy, godly life into all her members.

The Church is *catholic*, which is but poorly and partially rendered by "universal." Latin rightly understood that this word should not be translated, for then it would surely have used the word "universalis" or "communis," or something like it. "Catholic" is not only an expression for distance in place and time, but far more an expression for character or nature. It tries to express both the unity and the

holiness of the Church and says that the catholic Church is always the same and remains the same, always and through all ages. Every congregation which professed the one Lord and upheld the faith preached by the apostles, and passed on and carried forth the ancient "depositum" in word and life, could feel assured that in her the "holon" was at work and alive, that one, undivided "totality" which constitutes the Church of Christ. For this reason "catholic" is the criterion of purity, which is not shown by number and size but by the purity of preaching, by the pure and chastened nature of its cult, by the pure nature of its organic institution, by the purity of its ethics and its life. And that church is the purest which can test its purity by the best that was exhibited in these respects by the Church throughout the centuries, back to the apostles.

The Church is *apostolic*. This means that the Church derives its universalism, its life and its order, from the apostles. Apostolicity expresses the character of tradition and continuity of the Church, of its faith and of its structure. It is clear that a church ceases to be "apostolic" as soon as it differs from the church of the apostles, as soon as it no longer "continues steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine."

But "apostolicity" also has a concrete meaning in the confession of the Church; it has at all times been used to express the originality of its *orders*. The Church demands *order*. I once formulated this as follows: "The character of human society, in which organic joints can never be missing—because otherwise the whole would break up and become barren and hopeless chaos—demands in the Church of Christ, being the mystic organism in which divine life comes down to man, an office for the mediation of salvation, and this office derives its character both from the *divine* nature of Him who is the *source* of salvation and from the *human* nature of the *object* of this salvation. The office, therefore, possesses a mandate directly given by God, but, by virtue of the organic character of the church society, transmitted in the way of church organization." I meant to say that the ecclesiastical office—the ministerium—is not a matter of chance, but that it is a commandment, originating from the Gospel, and that a church which dispenses with it not only seriously damages its character as church, but even loses it. The "ministry" is based on the mission of the apostles by the Lord Himself and was consolidated in the earliest apostolic days into the offices of bishops and presbyters, whose tasks are described as shepherding the flock of the Lord, feeding the church of God, preaching and exhorting, administering the grace of God and the laying on of hands to transfer the ministerial power, the only way in which the ministerial office can be obtained.

I believe that it is historically unassailable that from the earliest times the episcopal-presbyterial office in the Church was the durable institution which became the distinguishing mark of and guarantee for the purity and continuity, so that catholicity and apostolicity continually and without interruption were going hand in hand.

The kernel of this ecclesiastical order remains the laying on of hands by the bishops. I do not believe that the difference between episcopus and presbyter means more or less endowment with Holy Spirit, bu

that it is a gradation, originating from the nature of order itself, the laying on of hands naturally becoming the task of the "overseers" or bishops and the spiritual charge that of the presbyters or priests.

This process of growth is so old and so constant, and is so directly and immediately linked up with the work of the apostles, that it is incomprehensible for us that the churches of the Reformation often abolished the ecclesiastical office of bishop or else weakened and reduced it to a merely administrative office of government.

The Old Catholic Church therefore attaches much importance to the *apostolic succession—i.e.*, it wants to make sure that its orders possess the apostolic character, and the laying on of hands by the lawful church officials in the presence of the congregation is considered to warrant this. *No holder of order can be without flock.* It is not the office which creates the church, but the church demands and calls the office. About the apostolic succession we expressed the following in 1937 at Edinburgh: "We maintain that episcopacy is of apostolic origin and that it belongs to the essence of the Church. The Church is the bearer of the ministry. The ministers act only by the commission of the Church. The ministry is received, administered and handed on in the same sense and in the same way as the Apostles handed it down to the Church. The Apostolic Succession means the inseparability of Church and ministry and the continuity of both." He who grasps the meaning of this statement will gather that we consider the ministry inconceivable without the Church, the only source of its existence; that we do not believe in, nor attach value to, so-called "lines of succession" which pretend to purify or validate a ministry; of vital importance, however, is the integrity of the Church, its catholicity and its apostolicity, which calls to the ministry and hands it on, again in behalf of the Church, of course. I will try to say it even more clearly, more concretely: we, Old Catholics, are convinced that, by participating in the consecration of bishops in the Church of England, we cannot make its episcopal order more pure, more catholic and more apostolic; the consecration act is not a transfusion or purification or invigoration of blood: this would be a mechanical, material, manichean way of looking at it, for which there is no place in Christianity. Participation in a consecration should be preceded by the firm conviction that we take part in the mediating of grace of a church that is genuinely catholic and apostolic, and our very participating is proof of that conviction. For this reason our Church is firmly and deeply convinced that the consecrations and ordinations of "episcopi vagantes" are null and void; exactly the catholicity and apostolicity of the Church are lacking here—nay, even the Church is missing; and where there is no church, no order is handed on, even if it should be done by a duly installed official of a truly catholic church. I cannot, by my own will, consecrate my butler a bishop. And supposing this butler conjured up a church and I in an evil hour believed in it, then the imposition of my hands would never consecrate this impostor a bishop; for after all, "non ego consecro, sed Christus est qui consecrat"; a man may be deceived, but the grace of God cannot be stolen. We base this attitude on the axiom of the ancient church: not only "nulla

ecclesia sine episcopo," but also "nullus episcopus sine ecclesia." The lack of restraint which we witness in the world of "episcopi vagantes," of theosophists and so-called liberal catholics who consecrate bishops and ordain priests only in order to transfer a mysterious power, where the question whether there is a church, a flock that wants a minister, is of no account whatever, is an uncatholic and therefore unchristian trifling with values that are not at our but only at God's disposal. This is gross gnosticism and has nothing whatever to do with Christian grace-life or with a mandate of Christ.

All the same the question still remains: what do we think of the ministry of other churches? Let me begin by telling you first of all that the apostolicity of the Church finds its expression, it is true, in the apostolicity of its ministry, but is not exhausted in it. The Church is not apostolic because its ministers are, member after member, linked up with the first centuries of Christendom; this conception, which used to be rather prevalent and is still occasionally met with, sees therein the best interpretation of the idea of apostolic succession and seeks its force in all kinds of succession-lines; but it is extremely mechanical, and might even become fatal to the Church the moment somebody discovered a flaw in the chain, perhaps never suspected before. The Church is apostolic by reason of its faith, its doctrine, its ethics, and because through the ages it is traditionally connected with Christ and the Apostles; and the ministry is "part and parcel" of this traditional tie. We may not isolate it, remove it from the apostolic heritage. The ministry belongs to the catholic "holon," and is indispensable in the human structure of the organic church. We are quite willing to admit that the grace of Christ and the anointing of His Spirit may be found in any church which confesses the one Lord and His undivided faith; but at the same time we consider indispensable the holy mandate and authority in the name of Christ, which on the side of man is carried into effect by the means of laying on of hands, in virtue of the will and consent of the Church. The church that loosens this bond runs the risk of atomic splintering and exposes itself to the danger of an individualism which denies collective responsibility and replaces it by arbitrariness. I admit at once that many churches of the Reformation are practically much more ministerial and much more bound by the ministry than their theology might lead us to expect; but the apostolicity which consciously retraces its steps through the ages to the origin is here felt to be painfully missing by a catholic, and in his eyes the ministry is affected with defectiveness. And I am afraid that for the present this will remain a difficult obstacle on the road of the ecumenical movement.

✠ Andreas Rinkel
(*Archiepiscopus Ultraiectensis*).

(*To be concluded*)

Why You Should Read It—X

"RELIGIO MEDICI"

THERE is no English writer who engages the reader's affection with a more charming intimacy than Sir Thomas Browne. He discourses to us, very much as Montaigne had done, with an unaffected egotism, taking it for granted that we care to hear his reflections, especially as he never presses them upon us. "This," he says to us in effect, "is how I have come to think about the mysteries of the universe and human destiny; these are my present thoughts, and some of them may need correction by wiser heads and by my own maturer judgment, but such as they are I offer them for your consideration." If he had not himself told us that he had written *Religio Medici* when "as yet I have not seen one revolution of Saturn, nor hath my pulse beat thirty years," we should have taken the book to be the fruit of a contemplative mind in the middle years of life.

Thomas Browne, son of a London mercer, received his education at Winchester College and at Broadgates Hall, Oxford, of which he was a fellow-commoner. When that ancient hall was reconstituted as Pembroke College in Browne's second year he made one of the Latin orations in honour of the event. After taking his two degrees in arts he studied medicine at Montpellier, Padua, and Leyden. The universal use of Latin for academic lectures would enable him to follow them in three Continental countries. Leyden was the first university to provide clinical lectures, and here he graduated as M.D., proceeding later by incorporation to the same degree at Oxford. In or about the year 1635, while practising medicine near Halifax, he wrote *Religio Medici* as "a private Exercise directed to my self," apparently without thought of publication. Two years later he settled at Norwich, where he practised for the next forty-five years till his death in 1682. He numbered among his patients and friends the admirable Bishop Joseph Hall, who continued to live for ten years in retirement near Norwich after the "hard measure" which had been dealt out to him on his expulsion from the bishopric. All his life Browne pursued his love of antiquities, lavishing his out-of-the-way miscellaneous knowledge, the riches of his imagination and his inimitable prose style on such books as *A brief Discourse of the Sepulchrall Urnes lately found in Norfolk*, and towards the end of life he compiled a valuable record of the monuments in the cathedral church. Charles II, visiting Norwich in 1671, conferred on him the honour of knighthood, to the evident pleasure of his fellow-citizens. A few weeks later John Evelyn, a kindred spirit, visited Browne in his home, which he describes as "a paradise and cabinet of rarities." Browne's natural and affectionate relations with his sons are revealed in the pride he took in his eldest son, who rose to become President of the College of Physicians, and in the letters that passed between Browne and his sailor son Tom in the summer of 1666. Tom tells his father how in recent naval actions his spirits have so risen that danger is forgotten, and he adds: "In and after sea-fights I have been very thirsty." The father in reply gives a gentle

warning: "Be warie, for La Rochelle was a place of too much good fellowship and a very drinking town, as I observed when I was there"; but he also commends the boy's open-handedness in giving his pieces of eight to the sailors whose pay was in arrears: "God hath given you a stout but a generous and merciful heart withal, and in all your life you could never behold any person in misery but with compassion and relief; which hath been notable in you from a child." Sir Thomas's useful and honourable life ended on his seventy-seventh birthday, and he was buried in the noble church of St Peter Mancroft, where he had habitually worshipped.

As a writer of prose Browne developed a style peculiarly his own, with a free use of sonorous words often of his own mintage ("hyper-latinistic," as Coleridge called them) and with a rare feeling for rhythm and cadence. There are paragraphs of unsurpassed magnificence in *Urn-Burial* and *The Garden of Cyrus*, which he published when he was fifty-three; but already in *Religio Medici* there is hardly a sentence which does not captivate the ear and deserve to be lovingly savoured. Assuredly Browne wrote for his own delectation, but his readers enter into his enjoyment.

For about seven years *Religio Medici* was known to his friends only through manuscript copies, but they must have been many, as no less than eight copies have survived, none of them in the author's hand. In 1642 a London publisher produced two editions surreptitiously. Browne heard with some concern that Sir Kenelm Digby was on the point of printing his *Observations* on the book, and he begged him to desist until an authorized edition appeared; but Digby forestalled the first authentic edition of 1643. Two editions of a Latin version appeared at Leyden in the next year, and it was also reprinted in Paris. Editions in English and Latin continued to appear throughout the century, and there were also translations in Dutch, French and German. Evidently the book appealed to a generation in which the arrival of modern science challenged inevitably, if also often unwillingly, the traditional presentation of the Christian faith. Here was one trained in a scientific profession who also claimed "the honourable Stile of a Christian." Like an amphibious being that is equally at home on land and in water, Browne lived "in divided and distinguished worlds." He tells us that he had once thought it "only a pleasant trope of Rhetorick to call ourselves a Microcosm, or little World," till his "near judgement and second thoughts" told him "there was a real truth therein." He would, I think, have welcomed von Hügel's emphasis on "that inseparably mixed, spirit and sense, creature man," and on the duty of making provision for both the corporeal and the spiritual existence of man. His profession obliges him to attend to the body's needs, but as a Christian he may not forget the needs of the soul. "I never hear the Toll of a passing Bell, though in my mirth, without my prayers and best wishes for the departing spirit. I cannot go to cure the body of my patient, but I forget my profession and call unto God for his soul." He strives to preserve both his intellectual integrity as the follower of a learned profession and his continued hold on the essentials of Christian faith. He can give free

rein to his speculative and paradoxical fancy where he is not restrained by the language of Scripture or the doctrines of the Church, but he will also allow himself the use of allegorical interpretation, as of the "days" in the story of Creation: "Unspeakable mysteries in the Scriptures are often delivered in a vulgar and illustrative way; and being written unto man, are delivered, not as they truely are, but as they may be understood." The mysteries of the faith, such as the miracles of Christ, the Trinity, and Eternity, so far from repelling him, attract his mind: "I love to lose myself in a mystery, to pursue my Reason to an *O altitudo!*" "Where there is an obscurity too deep for our Reason, 'tis good to sit down with a description, periphrasis, or adumbration . . . and thus I teach my haggard and unreclaimed reason to stoop unto the lure of Faith." In that large sense he trusts to make good his claim that "in Divinity I love to keep the road, and, though not in an implicite, yet an humble faith, follow the great wheel of the Church."

The comprehensive spirit of a church that could draw to its ministry Lancelot Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor, John Hales and Benjamin Whichcote, and in which George Herbert was its ideal parish priest, was the congenial spiritual home of Thomas Browne. "There is no Church," he writes, "whose every part so squares unto my Conscience; whose Articles, Constitutions, and Customs seem so consonant unto reason, and as it were framed to my particular Devotion, as this whereof I hold my Belief, the Church of England, to whose Faith I am a sworn Subject." He professed to "dislike nothing" in it "but the Name" of Protestant, with its negative associations. He protests that it is "a gross errour . . . to compute the Nativity of our Religion from Henry the Eighth," and he rejoices to think how much there is in common with Christians of other communions and nationalities: "therefore," he says, "I am not scrupulous to converse and live with them, to enter their Churches in defect of ours, and either pray with them, or for them." To "the Bishop of Rome," he avows, "we owe the duty of good language": "Heretick is the best language he affords me; yet can no ear witness I ever returned him the name of Antichrist, Man of Sin, or Whore of Babylon." "At my Devotion I love to use the civility of my knee, my hat, and hand, with all those outward and sensible motions which may express or promote my invisible Devotion. . . . I could never hear the *Ave-Mary* Bell without an elevation, or think it a sufficient warrant, because they erred in one circumstance, for me to err in all, that is, in silence and dumb contempt."

Browne is essentially tolerant and would allow others the freedom of thinking that he claims for himself. "I could never divide my self from any man upon the difference of an opinion, or be angry with his judgement for not agreeing with me in that from which perhaps within a few days I should dissent my self." He regrets that there should be controversy in religion, and especially when it is heated and intolerant. He conceives it possible that "revolution of time and the mercies of God may effect" a reconciliation; but it may be long delayed beyond his lifetime, and meanwhile he will maintain a peaceable spirit. "I have no Genius to disputes in Religion," and "Every

man is not a proper Champion for Truth, nor fit to take up the Gauntlet in the cause of Verity."

More than one writer about *Religio Medici* has justly remarked that there is a line of John Donne—"All divinity is love and wonder"—which exactly fits Browne's mind and temper. Indeed, it is his best aid towards finding such harmony as he can between "the divided and distinguished worlds" of matter and spirit. Just as Bacon looked for illumination to "the book of God's works" as well as to "the book of God's words," so Browne affirms: "There are two Books from which I collect my Divinity; besides that written one of God, another of his servant Nature, that universal and publick Manuscript. . . . Nor do I so forget God as to adore the name of Nature." It is, above all, the wonder of the natural world that calls out his constant admiration, and the acknowledgment of the beauty of the universe is, as Wordsworth declared it to be, "a task light and easy to him who looks at the world in the spirit of love." And while Browne contemplates with delight the intricate ways of nature, in the lowliest as well as in the most majestic of its phenomena, he reserves his highest admiration of created things for man himself. "There is surely a piece of Divinity in us, something that was before the Elements, and owes no homage unto the Sun. Nature tells me I am the Image of God, as well as Scripture: he that understands not thus much, hath not his introduction or first lesson, and is yet to begin the Alphabet of man." "We carry with us the wonders we seek without us: There is all Africa and her prodigies in us."

In this generous spirit and with this enlarged mind Browne began, as he was to end, his professional life, living in charity with all men, rejoicing in all that united men of different races and creeds, and finding ever-increasing delight in nature, which he takes to be "the Art of God." *Religio Medici* abounds in fresh and arresting thoughts about man and nature, God and Eternity, but it is an essay in which the author shares his confidences with any friendly reader, not an orderly and philosophical treatise. When his reasoning fails to convince us—as often, indeed, it ought not—his Christian temper is wholly admirable, and it is infectious. Very characteristic of the author of *Religio Medici* is his aspiration at the close of the book:

> Bless me in this life with but peace of my Conscience, command of my affections, the love of thy self and my dearest friends, and I shall be happy enough to pity Cæsar. These are, O Lord, the humble desires of my most reasonable ambition, and all I dare call happiness on earth; wherein I set no rule or limit to thy Hand or Providence; dispose of me according to the wisdom of thy pleasure. Thy will be done, though in my own undoing.

F. E. Hutchinson.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. R. Porter is Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Chichester.

The Rev. J. G. Davies, B.D., is Curate of the Church of St Mary and St Paul, Rotherhithe.

Mr Gilbert Walton is a Biology Master at Highgate School.

The address by the Archbishop of Utrecht was given at an informal meeting of theologians in Oxford on the occasion of his recent visit. It is being published as it was delivered, at the request of various people who were present.

Dr F. E. Hutchinson, formerly Canon Residentiary of Worcester Cathedral, is a Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. By Spencer Leeson. Longmans. 15s.

In December 1940 a small group met at Winchester to discuss the Church's policy in view of the forthcoming Education Act. The chairman of that group, as afterwards of the Christian Education Movement which resulted from that meeting, was Canon Spencer Leeson. Over and over again at the meetings of the Council which were held during the succeeding years, he expressed the desire to see the authorities of the Church issue "a full-scale statement on Christian education, an encyclical in the grand manner."

And now he has done it himself: and the Church may well be grateful to him. For his treatment of the subject combines in a way which would be scarcely possible for any other living writer the first-hand experience of the teacher, the technical knowledge of the trained administrator, and the passion of the evangelist.

It is the last of these three qualities which really dominates the book. The note which rings through it, and keeps breaking out like a refrain, is the sense, at once humble and authoritative, of the greatness and wonder of the Christian Gospel which teachers are commissioned to proclaim. There will, I fancy, be some head shaking, and maybe heart searching, among members of the profession at the tremendous claims which Canon Leeson makes for teachers of religion and the equally heavy responsibility which he lays upon them. But there is no shadow of doubt that his essential insistence is true. The day is past when "religious instruction," scholarly and painstaking as that might be, will meet the need. The schools are called to decide whether or no they can join with the Church and the family in something far more radical than that, the rehabilitation of the Christian view of human life as a "reputable intellectual option," and still more as a living faith.

Canon Leeson does not allow his passion to run away with him. His book is frankly "propaganda," and he makes it clear that he is not ashamed of the word. But it is propaganda which has reflected deeply upon the principles on which it is based and, what is more, knows its facts. The earlier chapters, which lay the foundation for the main body of the argument, expose with complete candour the dangers which threaten education as a whole from the lack of any clear and coherent conviction of what it is that we are aiming at in educating anybody at all; and that in turn is shown to spring from a deeper uncertainty still—our unwillingness to face and answer the root

question: What is man? What is this human nature which we are seeking to mould and train; and what is its true destiny?

That leads inevitably to a review, at once enthusiastic and searching, of Plato's conception of education as the training of the soul, and then to the developed criticism of that conception in the light of the Christian revelation and of the historical attempt of the Church in Europe to translate the revelation into practice.

With Lecture IV, "The Climate of Opinion and its Effect," we reach our own contemporary period. This is, as the author himself acknowledges in his foreword, the least satisfactory section of the book. It is impossible to avoid a feeling that the analysis as a whole is concerned too much with past conflicts and controversies, and hardly reaches the point at which the full significance of the intellectual revolution, or *débâcle*, to which they have led is really faced. There are indeed later passages in which Canon Leeson shows that he understands clearly enough the pathetic state of confusion, of intellectual abdication and spiritual unsatisfiedness from which many parents and teachers are suffering. And there is a footnote on page 95 which might well be expanded into several pages. But it may be hoped that in a second edition another whole chapter, carrying the analysis a good deal further, may be added.

From then on the treatment of the theme moves steadily forward, presenting a masterly grasp of the situation created by the new Act, and a refreshingly just and candid estimate of the attitude to its provisions alike of churchmen, teachers, and those responsible for administration. It would be impossible, in my judgment, to better the objective fairness with which he states the view, Roman Catholic and Anglican, which regards the present solution of the dual system as inadequate and unjust (pp. 149-152), or the penetration with which he lays bare the pitfalls which surround an unwise and unimaginative use of the statutory provision of religious teaching and worship (pp. 194-196). It is to be hoped that many teachers and parents, who may not have the interest or the patience to digest the whole book, will at least borrow it to read pages 217-218, where they will find as pungent a description of the nation's apprehension of the issues at stake as could well be penned.

Above all, it is to be hoped that the clergy will read the book. For it speaks to our condition in no uncertain terms. It brings home to us the measure of our failure in the past (there is a phrase which recurs over and over again: "I make no attempt to apportion responsibility: we are all to blame"); and it sets before us, with a passion which must surely kindle us to fresh effort, the greatness of our task as "servants of the Word."

ARTHUR BRISTOL.

Jesus: The Gospel Portrait. By Douglas Edwards, C.R. Bles. 7s. 6d.

The New Bible Handbook. Edited by G. T. Manley. Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 10s. 6d.

These are both significant books, though in vastly differing ways. The one is Catholic and scholarly; the other not only the work of Protestants, a fact which in itself counts for little in regard to scores of excellent books, but *is* Protestant and, in keeping with this usage of the word, fundamentalist.

The first is significant as the reissue of a work of twenty years ago, *The Shining Mystery of Jesus*; though, as is explained on its jacket, the central chapters contain new matter, the first has been rewritten, whilst the last is quite new. It thus appeared long before the point of view of the Cambridge School of which Sir Edwyn Hoskyns was in such large measure the inspiration, and of which *The Riddle of the New Testament* is so fine a representative, had gained its present deservedly wide recognition; that school of which we may regard Dr C. H. Dodd as the present leader, though admittedly he has much less to say about the doctrine of the Incarnation than his Anglican fellows, confining himself rather to more strictly New Testament study. Concern with the Incarnation has ever been the true glory of our Anglican scholarship, even when it is New Testament scholarship that is in view, a point duly appreciated, for example, in Fr Congar's *Divided Christendom*. And Fr Edwards is Catholic and Anglican above all else.

His book sets out to let the Gospel portrait of Jesus speak for itself, which is another way of saying that it confronts its reader with Jesus Himself. It succeeds in this to an eminent degree. It isolates the Lord from His contemporaries as effectively as it makes its readers contemporaries of the Lord, compelled as were the men of His own day to ask the leading question, "Who is this?" and compelled like them to learn the inadequacy of every merely humanist answer. In four of his chapters Fr Edwards never once lets his readers escape the searching glances of the Lord of whom he writes as had the evangelists before him. These chapters bear the significant titles, His Character, His Carriage, His Impact, and His Claim, and they are packed with scholarly, devout challenge. The last chapter, His Origin, says nothing that Fr Edwards had not already said in his larger work *The Virgin Birth in History and Faith*, though it says it clearly and well. Whereas the former chapters answer the question "Who is this?" the latter takes up the question "How came he here?" Consequently it is not easy to see how it does other than detract from the beautifully rounded character of the earlier chapters. One has the feeling that it has been unnaturally added to his earlier work, doubtless because its author rightly feels that the issue it raises is of such moment. It would be uncharitable to suggest that in it he lets the bee in his bonnet buzz once more. This is in no way to take sides in this issue: it is but to express what many will feel. There are many who accept the doctrine of the Virgin Birth who will not be prepared to agree with Fr Edwards when he writes on page 110: "It is in fact our knowledge of the Virgin

Birth that enables us boldly to identify the Subject of the Gospel Portrait with none other than God Himself made man for our salvation." Our faith in the Incarnation surely rests on no such inverted pyramid as this. This is our first criticism. The other is that just because much of this book appeared twenty years ago it contains traces of the polemic then being conducted by Christians such as Fr Edwards against the Liberal and Consciousness theologians. But even these theologians have taught us something, and if by now we have learned it, not ourselves being liberals, then that is all to the good. Two instances of this in the book must suffice. Both appear on page 86. Fr Edwards writes: "For the analysis of the self-consciousness of Jesus we have no data whatsoever." If this is true, how has it been possible for such a book as this to be written? Again, in approaching the answer to the question "Whom did He make Himself?" Fr Edwards says: "In attempting to answer this question . . . the claim to be Messiah . . . will be left out of account." This prompts the question whether we can thus separate the work and the person of Christ as Fr Edwards seems to imply. Personally, I don't think we can: such an expedient sounds too much like separating doctrines which are organically related—to wit, the Incarnation and Atonement.

The New Bible Handbook is neither new nor is it a handbook such as will commend itself to serious students. One reads it with mingled feelings of amusement and sadness; amusement at its fantastic argument and lack of argument in defence of its standpoint, and sadness at its perverse disregard for the findings of modern scholars. Its contributors, whose individual work is not identifiable, still believe in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and laud its contents indiscriminately for this reason, even to the point of agreeing that Moses was wise to ban pork anyway, since it is a meat which easily deteriorates! They still regard Daniel and Revelation as in part Old Moore's almanacs of the Bible. Like other books of its kind it makes full use of the supposed help of archæological discoveries in defence of its literalism, and gives archæology a ridiculously disproportionate amount of space accordingly. That it is a book with some values none will deny, especially where the real Christian faith of its writers shines through in spite of their obscurantism, as for instance in a few only of the suggested themes for further study appended to each chapter. One quotation must be made from page 60: "Miracles are not breaches of the laws of nature, but, on the contrary, must be regarded as bringing back order into a disordered world." That is well said, and it is true. But it has been better said recently by C. S. Lewis in *Miracles*. Most of what is well said in this book has been better said elsewhere.

E. Ridley Lewis.

Harvest Hill,
Bourne End, Bucks.

THE REDEMPTION OF ISRAEL. By John Friedman. Sheed and Ward. 8s. 6d.

Here is a book on a subject of permanent as well as contemporary interest, and of intimate concern to all who have at heart the welfare of the whole Israel of God. The problem of the relation between Israel after the Old Covenant and Israel after the New dates back, as the writer shows, right into the earliest ages of Biblical history. The central crisis is seen to have taken place in the treatment of Him, whose Blood sealed the New Covenant between God and man, and obtained eternal redemption. And no one who has had anything to do with present-day Jewish Christian work will need any reminder of the many urgent questions demanding sympathetic attention, and ultimately an answer.

The main part of the book is devoted to a development of the writer's thesis that the history of mankind, included in which is Jewish history, is to be explained by reference to a certain definite scheme. There are "three well-defined and well-documented epochs . . . called the Egyptian, the Babylonian and the Universal Epochs after their most characteristic features." And "in each epoch there is a cycle of three phases, the same for successive epochs, and each reflecting a religious category. These are, in order, of sin, of punishment for sin, of salvation from sin." There is more than a suspicion of artificiality about the way that the writer proceeds to make history fit this scheme. Clearly, certain periods present perfect examples of this pattern, as is shown, for instance, in the book of Judges. But other periods are less obliging, and the writer betrays a hint of his difficulty in his Introduction.

Dr Friedman's book is noteworthy as coming from the pen of a South African convert from Judaism to Roman Catholicism. Not only has he inside knowledge of all that Jewish tradition can mean for the modern Israelite, but also he is able to write with the passionate fervour of a convert who has not turned his back on his ancestors, and who wishes them to enjoy with him all the benefits of the "Catholic solution." Non-Roman Catholic readers may be excused for feeling that occasionally the writer is guilty of making excessively enthusiastic claims for his new-found faith, and some of his generalizations are hardly fair to non-Roman Catholic Christianity—*e.g.*, "Catholicism is markedly superior to any form of non-Catholic Christianity, whose weaknesses are strikingly revealed when faced with the practical solution of the Jewish problem. The obvious reason is that the Jewish people are an international community, and the Catholic Church is the only equivalent international ecclesiastical body capable of welding Christian Jews into a spiritual whole. . . . Only through Holy Church can Jews hope to take up their real mission in the world" (p. 131). But making allowance for such as this, the reader will find much of salutary truth in this same chapter, which deals with the Jewish problem. It cannot be too often or too emphatically stated that a Jew by becoming Christian does not cease to be a Jew but becomes a better Jew. It is by no means always easy to convince the would-be convert of this, neither is it simple for the

old-established Christian to grasp. A reading of this book may help many to reach this very necessary understanding, and so help forward the realization of the unity of the whole Israel of God.

If another edition is called for, two minor suggestions may not be amiss. The English style is not always easy to read and might well be simplified if certain obscure formations (*e.g.*, maturation, summation) were avoided. An index, including references to the many Biblical and non-Biblical authors quoted, would add to the value of the book.

C. Witton-Davies.

St George's Close,
Jerusalem.

The Œcumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement. By H. R. T. Brandreth. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Though the title lacks precision, this is a very useful book. It gives in a brief compass all, or nearly all, the approaches towards reunion, on either side, between the Church of England and Rome from the feelers thrown out by Panzani and Leander in the reign of Charles I down to the conversations at Malines. Strange to say, it omits all mention of the *Paraphrastica Expositio* of the XXXIX Articles by Sancta Clara (Christopher Davenport), a Franciscan, and chaplain to Queen Henrietta Maria, in which he clearly anticipated Newman's argument in his famous Tract XC, maintaining that two of the Articles were "mere logomachies," and the rest, if not "ambitious," at least "patient," of a Catholic interpretation.

The book gives the main developments in our relations with the Orthodox East during the past century; it traces the steps leading up to intercommunion with the Old Catholics in 1931, but is silent on our relations with the Lutherans, including the Church of Sweden, and has little to say about non-episcopal Protestants at home.

The early Tractarians were too much occupied with their own immediate problems to take any active steps towards reunion, but before long a definitely Romanizing party emerged, headed by W. G. Ward and Frederick Oakeley, whose aim was absorption by Rome rather than reunion. In the first tentative efforts which were made towards reunion a Roman Catholic layman, Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, took the initiative. Assisted by several Tractarians, he helped to found the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, which flourished until, in 1864, Roman Catholics were forbidden to belong to it. Dr Pusey, however, did not lose heart, and in reply to an attack by Manning in 1864 published an *Eirenicon* as an attempt at conciliation. Newman described it as an olive branch discharged from a catapult, so it can hardly be said to have succeeded in its intention.

The last and most serious attempt at reunion was made in the so-called Malines Conversations, when an equal number of Roman Catholic and Anglican theologians met under the presidency of Cardinal Mercier to discuss their outstanding differences unofficially. The Conversations continued at intervals, amicably if indecisively, until after the death of Cardinal Mercier in 1925, when by order from Rome they came to an end.

As we survey the various attempts, however tentative, which have been made towards reunion we are struck by the enthusiasm shown by individual Roman Catholics and Anglicans on the one hand, and the obduracy of Rome on the other. The doctrine of papal autocracy has always been the stumbling-block, and on that point Rome has never budged an inch.

Reunion with the Orthodox East is another matter. There the prospects are hopeful, but we still have to convince the Orthodox that we abide by the Catholic principles for which the Tractarians contended. Mr Brandreth sketches the progress which has been made, but omits to mention the successive recognitions of the validity of Anglican Orders by the Patriarchates of Constantinople (1922), Jerusalem (1923), Alexandria (1930), Roumania (1936), respectively, though the matter has not yet been considered in full synod. It can be said of reunion with the East that there is no irreconcilable difference, but there is a distrust in the East of Anglican orthodoxy, and that every step which Anglican bishops take towards appeasement with non-episcopal Protestants tends to deepen that distrust. Mr Brandreth has little to say about such approaches and is silent about South India, but the menace of South India remains, and if the policy of appeasement is carried much farther it will postpone indefinitely reunion with the East and relegate to the Greek kalends any hope of reunion with Rome.

C. P. S. Clarke.

Chichester.

The Shorter Prayer Book. The Privileged Presses. 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.

This is a useful book, though not everyone will like it, for it contains a considerable amount of material from the 1928 revision. But, in fact, the particular deviations here included have been widely adopted and not to have included them would have greatly impaired the book's usefulness. An existing situation is frankly recognized, and those who are not expert in the ways of the Church of England will find here as clear a guide to the ritual practice of unlabelled churchmanship as could well be devised. Those of us who have found ourselves returning more and more to 1662 have not returned so far that a mere abridgment of the 1662 book will clarify us to the uninitiated. We do not recite the Ten Commandments at every Communion. It would, however, be undesirable that this *Shorter Prayer Book* should come to acquire an apparent authority which it does not possess. Such a book is undoubtedly needed, and to denounce the bishops, as they have already been denounced in one quarter, for getting on with the job is merely to be unrealistic. It is not they who are to blame for unconstitutional procedure, but the synods whose inability to arrive at conclusions drives them to it. In this case they may very properly have hesitated to open the floodgates of ingenious debate. But it should be made clear (and should perhaps have been made clear in the book itself) that it is not more than a semi-official publication. This is the more necessary since it may probably become

the only form in which some congregations will handle the Prayer Book.

The account of the Christian year with which the book opens is well done, but a fear lest symbolism might be interpreted as an out-of-date cosmology seems to govern the somewhat inadequate notice of Ascension Day. Man's labour is alone mentioned as the subject of prayer at Rogationtide, the weather being by inference committed wholly to the charge of depressions over Iceland. Such criticism may seem quibbling, yet there may here be a more serious shift of emphasis than some which have attracted more attention.

The format of the book is admirable, and there is probably no better value for one's money to be had anywhere to-day. It is beautifully printed, and what a joy it is to meet with a book for use in church whose binding does not match the hassocks! Certainly it will give pleasure to the eyes of those who use it, and we believe its system of page references, its brackets and occasional double columns will help to smooth out puckered brows.

FRANK BENNETT.

WIGAN.

BUILDING NEW ORDERS. Christian Essays in Social Reconstruction. By T. G. Tuckey. Heffer. 4s. 6d.

The trouble with books, as Plato said, is that when you ask them questions they take no notice and still go on giving the same answers. Godfrey Tuckey was killed in Italy three years ago, and we sadly need what he would have had to tell us about the world in the shadow of Hiroshima and the task of the Church in that world. And yet these five essays, written at various times, mostly on active service, lose little of their significance with the passage of time. Godfrey had foreseen most of our problems: his answers will always deserve attention because he embodied so many of the virtues of which he writes.

A first-rate classical scholar, convinced that Greece and Rome had valuable contributions to make to our own society, he was prepared to act on his beliefs. The form of that action, he thought, must be political: "The dream of the classical humanist can only begin to be fulfilled when we have an economically just society, which will make freedom of speech and thought and enquiry a reality, which will make the artistic treasures of the past available to all." That belief led him in the end, a citizen of Eire which he loved, and essentially a scholar, to volunteer for the British Army and to die beside his tank.

The mental discipline of the classics shows clearly in the discussion "Who are Realists?" "To be a realist means to know what is real. That means knowing not only what the present situation is, and the facts of that situation, but the real, full and ultimate context of present facts," which he later shows is "a world which God made and visited and redeemed." Godfrey valued highly "a healthy scepticism, a refusal to believe that any person or institution is infallible, and a demand that any authority should produce its credentials before expecting obedience." We shall always need to follow his refusal "to

be misled by the use of words like freedom until we have enquired what freedom is."

"But the Socratic scepticism is not enough . . . we need a philosophy of life, a faith . . . on which we can build . . ." His faith was essentially reasonable and reasoned: "A Christian can have a critical, questioning mind just because he knows that our reason was not given to us to 'fust in us unused'." Prepared by a healthy scepticism, it was proof against cynicism; nor was it "hag-ridden by that fear of failure which vitiates so much human endeavour." It is no doubt significant that nowadays we speak less of building a new order. Ours is the disillusion. He was already pointing to the true foundations: "Although our task is great, we need not fear, for God builds victoriously in spite of us, but with us all the same. The Church to which we belong is the divinely chosen instrument of God's redemption of the world." "Even in apparent failure, we are more than conquerors, and we can joyfully and wholeheartedly attack everywhere and with all our might: 'for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.' "

D. G. S. Upton.

Into Thy Courts. By F. J. Taylor. Church Book Room Press Ltd. 5s.
Glad in Him with Psalms. By Michael Peck. Mowbray. N.P.

Mr Taylor's excellent and thoughtful little book on the principles and practice of Christian worship affords an interesting illustration of the *rapprochement* that has taken place in the last generation or two between the two main schools of thought within the Church of England. He writes as a convinced Evangelical of the straiter sort: indeed, to those bred up in a different tradition his frequent references to Calvin as a doctrinal authority rather than to our own Anglican divines may even have a touch of quaintness. Yet he at the same time exhibits a wide and catholic range of reading in liturgical science (including an appreciative acquaintance with Dom Gregory Dix's *Shape of the Liturgy*) and a strong sense of the importance of seemliness and order in worship and of the need of securing these along the lines not of subjective preference but of considered principle and historic usage. Time was when Evangelicals (no doubt largely as a protest against the "ritualism" of which they disapproved so ardently) exhibited a positively defiant indifference to such things. Mr Taylor himself admits that "in the nineteenth century there was a tendency to neglect and even to despise attention to details of public worship in evangelical circles, on the ground that the preaching of the Gospel was the one activity of supreme worth, so that preoccupation with ecclesiastical niceties could be judged an unworthy distraction from the primary Christian objective. But," he goes on, "it is an error to suppose that such an outlook represents the authentic evangelical tradition. The purpose of the Gospel is that man may be brought back . . . to . . . free but obedient dependence upon God"; and "this dependent relationship is expressed in worship." In his effort to describe what worship should be Mr Taylor has many excellent and helpful things to say—things which may not only assist in remedying

what he describes as the "dissatisfaction with the standards of worship observed in evangelical churches," but which those of a different way of thinking from his would do well to lay to heart. Such readers may indeed be often conscious of a difference of emphasis, yet they will find little with which they will positively disagree and a good deal of which they may perhaps feel themselves in particular need of being reminded.

In the case of Mr Peck's book—described on the title-page as "Devotions for use at Holy Communion taken from the Psalter"—a reviewer can obviously have no comment to make on the matter of it, but only on the choice of this that has been made and the appropriateness with which it has been arranged. As the Dean of York says in a brief preface: "A Book of Prayers this, all gold, no dross." The text of the Order of Holy Communion is printed on the left-hand pages, and the selections from the psalms on the pages opposite. Lovers of the psalms will derive much help and inspiration from such a use of them, to which (as Mr Peck says) "such masters of sanctity as Lancelot Andrewes have pointed the way."

C. S. Phillips.

Fordwich.

Christian Vocation in the Contemporary World. By Alexander Miller. S.C.M. Press. 3s.

"In the handiwork of their craft is their prayer": can this ever be more than a mocking ideal in the contemporary industrial set-up? Mr Miller sets out to re-examine the strong Reformation doctrine of the calling of every believer to total Christian obedience in his daily work. He believes that it stands, and must stand, though to fulfil a vocation requires not only an honest day's work, but a far more radical critique of the whole social setting of the "calling" than the Reformers deemed necessary.

He describes very clearly the problem which faces the man of conscience in industry to-day. "As he sees it, the Christian ideal is sound enough in a general and abstract sort of way, and he would like very much to be able to conform to it. But what is the good of pretending to love his neighbour as himself, when his livelihood and the livelihood of those who live by his wage-packet depend on his pushing ahead of his neighbour? . . . My own belief is that a large part of the reason for the growing alienation of the industrial workers from the Church . . . is the sense of this fundamental contradiction. The average man does not make an explicit choice, though the more self-conscious of them do. But the choice has to be made, and the average man makes it in practice by staying away from church. He feels that the Church can only be for those who are not soiled with the sordid work of the world as he is. So he leaves the Church precisely to those groups—to women folk and children, to old people for whom the intensity of the struggle is over, and for relatively sheltered professional middle-class groups who are not exposed to the brunt of it. Then because he sees himself shut out of the Church and homeless accordingly (though there is an unacknowledged moral integrity in his staying out), he curses the Church for a class show and feels still more justified in staying away."

But in choosing a job the young Christian has to contend not only with the moral issue, but with the completely unbiblical (Greek) assumption that a job is important and Christian "in proportion to its remoteness from the actual material process of production." Mr Miller makes an illuminating division of jobs into "impossible," "dubious," "satisfactory" and "uplift," and exposes the prejudices governing the traditional Christian assessment. For the Bible, he says, the primary justification of work is its necessity, and this puts all necessary work on an equality. Vocation can then be discussed, with less chance of bias, in terms of the individual's real capacity. "If we have stopped kidding ourselves that some particular merit attaches to professional or 'Church vocational' work, we need no longer kid ourselves that we are specially cut out for it."

Here is a deal of sound advice based on much sound theology. But one must challenge the statement that the Bible views work as "part of the 'curse' under which the whole of man's natural and social life lies" (p. 57). What then of the words, "My Father worketh until now, and I work"? Surely the Biblical teaching is that work is a Divine function, in which man is called to image and co-operate with His Creator. The Fall creates, not work, but drudgery. This distinction makes a lot of practical difference. For it is not enough to say of a job that it is necessary. It should be creative, and, if undertaken by a Christian as part of his ministry, may always be redemptive. But of this latter we hear nothing; yet it is ultimately the only *Christian* solution to the problem of the book.

JOHN A. T. ROBINSON.

BRISTOL.

SHORTER NOTICES

Christian Initiation. By A. E. J. Rawlinson. S.P.C.K. 1s.

After his *New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, a work of careful theology and lucid exposition, the Bishop of Derby's pamphlet on Christian Initiation, which although slight in form could have been weighty in content, is most disappointing. In the first place it attempts to cover too much ground. To intermingle a discussion of the nature of the outward sign of confirmation, unction, or laying on of hands and an investigation of the New Testament doctrine of the inward grace within the confines of one short lecture is to produce confusion, not clarity. Secondly, it is by no means free from self-contradictions. The bishop accepts the statement of Dom Gregory and Prof. Ratcliff as to the theory and practice of the Church in the patristic period, and yet this has no effect upon his interpretation of the New Testament evidence nor upon his attitude to contemporary problems. The Orthodox Church, he declares (p. 25), has no theological difficulty about the question, nor presumably has the bishop, since his final conclusion is merely a repetition of the doctrine of the Book of Common Prayer. Indeed, despite all the references to the works of modern writers on the subject, this is nothing more than yet another outline of the medieval position.

J. G. DAVIES.

The Priest and His People. By James Wareham. Mowbray. 5s.

Some, like myself, may have an innate dislike for books on the Ministry due, no doubt, to their natural dislike of being challenged and disturbed, but also to the fact that books on pastoralia can be very theoretical, pretentious, shallow and high-faluting.

None of this applies to Canon Wareham's small volume. It is one of those books that grow on you whilst you are reading them. It is above all sober in the biblical meaning of the word. It is, if I may mix the terms, inebriated throughout with the Scriptural sobriety of the Prayer Book. It is truly Anglican and refreshingly aloof from party slogans, *e.g.* in what he has to say about sacramental confession. Canon Wareham deals with the clergy in the sense of the Ordinal as Ministers of the Word and Sacraments. Perhaps his long chapter on the Ministry of the Word is the best although the other three on the Priest, the People, and the Ministry of the Sacraments and Services are not less sound and less attractive in both substance and manner of presentation.

What makes this book attractive is its modesty and humility. Its author does not claim any originality for what he says. Rather he quotes profusely from what he calls "wiser and better people." He has read widely, both ancient and modern authors, and the book bears witness to his reading and to his experience on every page. Everything he says about the Ministry in all its aspects, about the parish, about preaching, sacraments, services and the pastoral care for souls, is based on strong and sure convictions, nourished on the Scriptures and the Prayer Book. There are many wise, shrewd, humorous remarks, pithy and to the point. It is a practical book in the true sense, not in the false one which opposes "practice" to theology. If I have any quarrel with Canon Wareham it is over what he says on worship on pp. 37 ff. It seems that he puts asunder what God has joined together, the setting forth God's most worthy praise and the listening to his Word. Yet all Christian worship, whether the Eucharist or the Choir Offices, consists partly of the reading (and preaching) of the Word of God. Is not our hearing the Word an indispensable part of the worship which the Church offers to God through Jesus Christ the Word Incarnate? There seems to be a need for working out the dialectic between the "receiving" and the "giving" in Christian worship.

Ernest Gordon.

London.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Berean Press: William Robinson, *What Churches of Christ Stand For* (1s.).

Bertelsmann (Gütersloh): Hans Ehrenberg, *Luthertum ökumenisch und deutsch* (RM. 1.80).

Blackfriars: The Letter of St Thomas Aquinas to Brother John, "De Modo Studendi," Latin Text with Translation and Exposition by Victor White, O.P. (1s.).

Geoffrey Bles: Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Russian Idea* (18s.).

Christophers: Robert Pierce Casey, *Athanasius de Incarnatione, Part II* (15s.).

Church Book Room Press: F. F. Bruce, *Archæology and the New Testament* (3d.); M. Guthrie Clark, *J. C. Ryle* (9d.); Frank Colquhoun, *Charles Wesley* (9d.);

R. S. Dean, *William Temple* (9d.); W. Leathem, *John Wesley* (9d.); A. G. Pouncy, *Henry Martyn* (9d.).

DACRE PRESS: Michael Ramsey, *The Healing of Our Divisions: a sermon preached before the University of Oxford on April 27, 1947* (6d.).

DESCLÉE DE BROUWER: Various authors, *Ma Joie Terrestre où donc es-tu?* (Fr. 120).

EAST AND WEST LIBRARY: Isaak Heine, *Jehuda Halevi. Kuzari: the Book of Proof and Argument* (8s. 6d.); Solomon Schechter, *Selected Writings* (10s. 6d.).

L'EDITION UNIVERSELLE (BRUSSELS): Taymans d'Eypernon, S.J., *Les Paradoxes du Bouddhisme* (Fr. 130).

EPWORTH PRESS: Philip S. Watson, *Let God be God* (10s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: A. G. Hebert, *The Authority of the Old Testament* (15s.); C. S. Phillips and others, *Walter Howard Frere, Bishop of Truro* (16s.); Hugh Ross Williamson, *The Arrow and the Sword* (10s. 6d.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: *Who Shall Deliver Us?* (1d.).

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR ("St Augustine," Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol): Oscar Hardman, *A Prayer-Book for* 1949, *Part III* (6s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: P. T. Forsyth, *The Work of Christ* (10s. 6d.).

I.V.F.: H. A. E. Hopkins, *The Unknown God* (2d.); P. J. Wiseman, *Modern Archæology and the Bible* (6d.); P. W. Evans, *Sacraments in the New Testament* (2s. 6d.).

CHR. KAISER VERLAG (MUNICH): Karl Barth, *Dogmatik in Grundriss* (RM. 5.40).

KINGSGATE PRESS: Henry Cook, *What Baptists Stand For* (6s.); E. A. Payne, *The Baptist Movement in the Reformation and Onwards* (1s.); A. C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists* (12s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Lecomte du Noüy, *Human Destiny* (17s. 6d.); Mark Pontifex, *The Existence of God* (7s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: C. J. Cadoux, *Philip of Spain and the Netherlands* (18s.); G. E. Phillips, *The Transmission of the Faith* (10s. 6d.).

MACDONALD AND EVANS: W. G. De Burgh, *The Legacy of the Ancient World* (21s.).

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION: G. L. H. Harvey, *The Clergy and the Marriage of the Divorced* (1s. 3d.).

MOTHERS' UNION: V. B. Lancaster, *Called to Witness* (1s.); Dorothy M. Roberts, E. L. Hopewell Ash, and Emile Cammaerts, *The Child, Body . . . Mind . . . Spirit* (9d.).

MOWBRAY: A. W. F. Blunt, *The Spirit of Life* (1s. 6d.); Harold Sly, *A Lively Sacrifice* (2s.); *Cowley Sermons* (8s. 6d.).

O.U.P.; C.U.P.; EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE: *The Shorter Prayer Book* (boards 3s. 6d., cloth 2s. 6d.).

PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD: Anon., *The Call to National Prayer* (9d.); E. J. Palmer, *Christ's Partners* (9d.); Archbishop of Canterbury, *The South India Church: an Open Letter to Bishop Stephen Neill* (6d.).

PRIEURÉ D'AMAY, CHEVETOGNE (BELGIQUE): D. C. Lialine, *Une Etape en Ecclésiologie: Réflexions sur L'Encyclique "Mystici Corporis"* (n.p.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Emil Brunner, *Revelation and Reason* (25s.); A. R. Vidler, *Good News for Mankind* (3s.).

SHEED AND WARD: R. J. Loenerty, O.P., *The Apocalypse of Saint John* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (15s.); Marcu Beza, *Heritage of Byzantium* (8s. 6d.); Vera I. Arlett, *The Lonely Place* (1s.); Freda Collins, *Five Christian Plays* (1s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: E. M. Pearson, *The Lord's Prayer* (1s.).

SOCIETY OF SAINT WILLIBRORD: J. B. Dakin, *Saint Willibrord's Foundation and its Successors* (1s.).

S.P.G.: *Prayers of the World-Wide Church* (3s. 6d.).

STAPLES PRESS: S. L. Bethell, *The Winter's Tale* (10s. 6d.).

WATTS AND CO.: William Cobbett, *Cobbett's Legacy to Parsons* (6s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher